DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 033 070 SP 003 105

By-Sondermann, Fred A.

Institute in International Affairs (Colorado Springs, June 16-July 25, 1969). Director's Report.

Colorado Coll., Colorado Springs.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
Pub Date Jul 69
Note-62p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.20
Descriptors-*Institutes (Training Programs), *International Education, Program Design, Secondary School Teachers, Social Studies

A 6-week summer institute on "Comparative Systems in a World Setting" succeeded (1) in helping 41 high school social studies teachers from 21 states to gain a deeper understanding of contemporary international relations, of the problems and potentialities which reside in the coexistence of over 130 different nations with varying histories, customs, value patterns, and political, social, and economic institutions and processes; and (2) in impressing on them the importance of sound, solid teaching of international affairs, of infiltrating international material into their courses, and of their being agents of change in their own schools and systems. A major program strength was the establishment of a professional rapport between college and high school faculty members all of whom were engaged in a common learning situation centering on the transmission of materials, ideas, concepts, and methods which will be applicable in the classroom at both levels. Much of the success was attributed to informal programs and the absence of pressures and compulsions (e.g., tests on assignments, grades) which normally characterize educational processes. Techniques included use of simulation, slide-tape presentations, and the establishment and use of a resource center. (Included is discussion of planning and participant selection, a summary of results from participant evaluation forms, and the detailed schedule of presentations and discussions.) (JS)

EDO 33070

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

# DIRECTOR'S REPORT

# INSTITUTE IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

June 16 - July 25, 1969

Fred A. Sondermann, Professor of Political Science

The Colorado College
Colorado Springs, Colorado

SP003105

## I. Introduction

The Institute in International Affairs, entitled "Comparative Systems in a World Setting," which took place on the Colorado College campus during the summer of 1969 was addressed to the needs of High School teachers in the Social Studies area. It was designed to enlarge their knowledge and improve their competence in the field of international relations. Specifically, the objectives of the program were (a) to increase the quantity and improve the quality of High School instruction in the Social Studies field by introducing an international dimension into relevant courses; (b) to stress both similarites and variations among political/ideological, social/cultural, and economic systems which coexist in the world of the late 20th century; (c) to present these data within a historical framework; and (d) to relate Institute activities closely to the needs and potentialities of the classroom situation.

The subject matter of the instituted was designed to tie in closely to the practical needs of participants, by paying particular attention to the most suitable ways of infusing the new ideas which were developed into the High School curriculum, in such courses as World History, History of Western Civilization, American History, American Government, Civics, Current Events, Problems of Democracy, and similar courses within the Social Studies curriculum.

In planning and conducting this institute, the staff was persuaded of a very great need on the part of High School Social Studies teachers for the kind of knowledge, information, insight, and awareness which we attempted to supply. Our evaluation of this need was based on surveys of relevant literature, on discussions among ourselves and with colleagues

in various High Schools, and on the experience with a similar Institute during the summer of 1968. That experience clearly revealed to us what we had at first only suspected: namely, that there was, and remains, a great need for the enrichment and broadening of High School courses and curricula through the infusion of materials that are not focused entirely on American and Western experiences, attitudes, and predispositions.

## II. Operation of the Program

### 1. Planning

We submitted our original proposal for the 1969 Summer Institute in the spring of 1968. At that time, we had received support for an Institute in the summer of that year, but we lacked, of course, the practical experience which could come only from a "first run" with that Institute.

In our proposal for the 1969 Summer Institute, therefore, we reserved the right to introduce modifications into our plan of operation after we had experience with the 1968 Summer Institute, and after we had had an opportunity carefully to evaluate that experience. Pursuant to this stipulation, we submitted a somewhat revised proposal in the fall of 1969, which was approved by the U.S. Office of Education and which thenceforth formed the basis for our planning. We were also aided in our planning by many helpful suggestions from Mr. Foster of the U. S. Office of Education; by discussions among ourselves and with colleagues in other schools; and particularly by a constant stream of "feedback" from the participants in the 1968 Summer Institute. The result of all of this was that, while the basic approach and plan of operation remained fairly constant, many shifts and changes did occur

throughout the 1968/69 academic year which, in our judgment, contributed to a much improved final plan of operations for the program which is the subject of this report.

Many discussions and consultations took place in framing the program for the summer of 1969. Still, it is not possible for me to attribute specific successes - or, for that matter, specific problems - to any one of these discussions or consultations. What we are dealing with, it seems to me, is an incremental process, one that is in some measure intuitive rather than scientific. Furthermore, I am also persuaded that it is a mistake to plan every last detail of a six-week Institute ahead of time; rather, I believe that a degree of flexibility must be maintained, so that a plan of operations does not get in the way of responding creatively to the demands and expectations of the participants - and these can not be ascertained prior to the time the Institute actually gets underway.

As Director of the Institute, I did not ask for released time during the spring semester which I could devote exclusively to the planning and preparation of the Institute. While I felt responsible for arranging the best possible Institute, I also felt a sense of responsibility to my regular students during the academic year to be available to them on a full-time basis. Consequently, Institute-planning was done in addition to, rather than in place of, the performance of my regular duties. This exacts a price, to be sure, but I feel that I was able to perform both tasks simultaneously. In this, I was greatly aided by an efficient, intelligent, and sensitive Secretary. However, there is much to be said for giving a prospective director some block of time to be devoted exclusively to the planning function.

I have commented approvingly on the assistance I received from the program representative in the U.S. Office of Education, Mr. Charles Foster. His help was very valuable; his ideas and suggestions contributed much. At the same time, however, I must in all frankness say that the policies of the Office of Education (as distinct from the personal interest of Mr. Foster) made planning the Institute much more burdensome than this task should have been. I refer particularly to the uncertainty concerning the Institute budget. For a number of months, we did now know (a) how many participants we would finally be able to invite; and (b) what size staff we could count on. We were required to make frequent changes in our budget. My last count is that we had no less than six versions of the budget, and that the final decisions were not made until March of this year.

In particular, the budgetary uncertainty concerning Institute staff gave me many bad days. College faculty members usually make their decisions concerning summer work very early - usually no later than December/January. After I had been authorized to offer a summber job to certain of my colleagues, I later had to withdraw two of these offers; and still later was authorized to renew one of the offers. This is a painful procedure - it creates serious problems of morale, of professional and personal relationships; and, needless to add, for the faculty members involved, it also creates serious economic problems. It happens that I was able to find alternative employment for the two faculty members who had, at one stage of the budget, to be cut out of the Institute plans. But this does not make the procedure any more acceptable, and there were days when one was very tempted to review the value of the entire enterprise. I have checked this with other Institute Directors and find that many of them had similar experiences and similar reactions.

I am sorry if this sounds somewhat harsh and negative, but assume that the main value of this kind of Final Report lies in complete frankness. I hope that the Office of Education will be in a position to review its budgetary policies, so as to give a firm and fixed figure to prospective Institute Directors at a sufficiently early date to avoid the kinds of complications that ensued this year.

I did not attend the Director's Meeting in Washington this year. I had found it marginally useful during my first year as a new Director, but the program for this year did not indicate to me that my attendance there would be a prerequisite for organizing and conducting a successful Institute.

I did attend a three-day session in New York City for Institute Directors in the field of Civics and International Affairs, organized by Professor Westin and his staff at Teachers College. I found this meeting very useful and urge its continuance in future years. I say this in spite of the fact that I have certain reservations about the approach used; nonetheless, it was a good experience and affected my outlook and behavior throughout our Institute this summer.

My expectation had been that this meeting was designed to help us with what might be called the "nuts and bolts" problems of conducting Institutes. I was surprised when it turned out to be almost totally focused on an examination (and demonstration) of group processes, involving much attention to personal behaviors and interpersonal relations. I take it that this approach is highly regarded in the U. S. Office of Education, as possibly an important adjunct to Institutes.

My own reaction to this approach was, and remains, mixed. I have both intellectual and personal reservations about the approach, but I

am free to admit that I do not know enough about it to form a fixed judgment. I suppose I would be classified as being "task-oriented" rather than "process-oriented." Yet, I think of myself and of my colleagues here as being sufficiently sensitive to the needs and expectations of others, sufficiently attuned to the "human" factor in any group situation, to be able to cope with problems that arise. This has been my experience during the past two summers. I would not argue that those who feel that sensitivity training and other ingredients of group processes play an important part in an Institute should be prevented from utilizing available methods and procedures. On the other hand, I would express the hope that this will not become the criterion by which Institutes and other government-sponsored educational enterprises will be judged.

For this reason, I did not feel I could subscribe to a statement drafted subsequent to the New York meeting. I associate myself with the sentiments expressed in that statement about the Director's Meeting. In fact, I would go further than the statement and suggest that funds allocated for that meeting might well be used to expand Institute programs per se. The stress on group process, however, which was also incorporated into that statement, seems to me to be an open question - no doubt suitable for some, perhaps even many, Institutes; but not to be de rigeur for all.

2. Participants

We received a total of 1,110 inquiries and 661 completed applications. Appendix 2 below indicates the source of both inquiries and applications. We selected 42 participants, as also indicated in the same Appendix. (Note: One participant had to drop out at the last

moment because of illness in his family) Our applicants came from 48 states and the District of Columbia, as well as some foreign areas. Our participants came from 21 states.

Our selection criteria were as follows.

a. Participants had to teach in the Social Studies field, in grades 9 through 12.

b. There was no geographical limitation on participation in this summer's Institute, as there had been the previous summer (when participation was primarily restricted to Colorado and adjacent states, permitting only a few from other states.) This time the participants were selected on a nationwide basis.

c. Applicants were expected to have taught in the Social Studies field for at least 3 years.

d. We paid attention to the recommendations of the applicants' supervisors or department heads; we likewise paid attention to their undergraduate and graduate preparation, in terms of courses taken and grades achieved. We did not have a specific requirement that applicants had to have had a certain academic major or background, but we looked at the totality of applicants' academic background and record.

e. We gave preference to teachers who indicated in some manner that they intended to become "change agents" in their own course offerings and in their schools and systems. Likewise, we gave preference to applicants who were involved in course and curriculum revision in their districts or who otherwise appeared to be in positions of influence and leadership.

f. We gave preference to teachers who indicated their intention to continue in High School teaching and who were more than five years from retirement.

Our selection process worked as follows:

a. The Institute Director gave a preliminary screening to all completed applications and eliminated a considerable number, either because applicants lacked one or another of the requisite criteria or because they appeared to be altogether too mediocre and unpromising.

b. For each of the remaining applicants, a paragraph was written, including personal and academic information, recommendations, etc. Each member of the Selection Committee (which consisted of 5 staff members and the College's Director of Admissions) was asked to rank each applicant on a scale from 1 to 5. This having been done and the results compiled, the committee met to make the final selections. There was considerable agreement among the members of the committee about who the most promising and worthwhile applicants were, so that this phase of the selection process could proceed fairly rapidly.

c. We selected 42 participants and 30 alternates. Of those whom we had originally selected, 17 declined our invitation - either because they had also been accepted at other Institutes or because of a change in their personal or professional situation. This rather high number indicates (1) that we apparently selected some very good people, who were also selected by other Institute selection committees elsewhere in the country; (2) that many applicants make multiple appli-

cations; and (3) that there appears to be a "subculture" among High School teachers, probably including only a minority of them, who are particularly intent on improving their competence through the medium of summer institutes.

d. It seems to my colleagues and me that our selction criteria worked very well indeed. We were somewhat disappointed with less than a half dozen of our participants, who were perhaps not as verbally active as we had expected them to be. (I pause to say here, however, that verbal behavior in an Institute seems to me to be a very unsatisfactory criterion of how much a given participant actually gains from the experience). We were pleasantly surprised with perhaps another half dozen or so participants, who turned out to be more perceptive and actively contributive than we had expected them to be. The greatest number of participants were very good - which is what we had expected. We don't think that we made any serious mistakes in the teachers whom we selected. We may well have made some mistakes in those whom we did not select - but we will never know that.

Three additional points may be worth brief mention: (1) Is there merit to the suggestion that sometime there should be an Institute in which the worst applicants are the ones selected--on the basis that presumably they need the experience most? I don't think I'd like to direct that kind of Institute, but the thought did occur to me that, highly qualified and motivated as our participants were, and much as I think they gained from the Institute - there were no doubt others, less qualified

for whom the experience might have been at least equally important and perhaps even more so. Possible criteria for selection of such participants might have included a. poor educational preparation for their current or prospective teaching roles, and b. high motivation. (2) A surprisingly high number of our participants had already attended previous Summer Institutes (NDEA, NSF, etc.). For the most part, these were among the best, brightest, most ambitious teachers. We had begun by discriminating somewhat against those who had attended previous Institutes - when confronted by two applicants who seemed relatively equal in capacity, etc., one of whom had and one of whom had not attended a previous Institute, we would opt for the second. However, as it turned out, we got many "repeats," and I suspect that this is a fairly general phenomenon; (3) I think serious attention should be given to selecting more than one teacher from a given school. Many participants indicated that they felt very lonely, being the only one who had had this experience; that their effectiveness as "change agents" would be vastly increased if they had support from one or more colleagues who had gone through the same Institute. We had 4 teachers in this year's Institute who came from schools from where we had also had participants in the summer of 1968. The issue here is between spreading the impact of institutes over the largest possible number of schools or, on the other hand, focussing on some, rather few, schools and bringing about greater change there. At this point, I would opt for the second alternative.

3. **Staff**

The greatest impact on the program obviously comes from the permanent, full-time staff members. We had an excellent illustration of that fact in comparing the impact of Professor Maurice East of the University of Denver, who last summer was here only half of the time and this summer was here on a full-time basis. While he contributed greatly even last year, there just is no comparison between his impact then and now, when he could spend full-time with the Institute. This confirms my previous notion that, if at all possible, staff-members should give their full time to the enterprise. Only Professor Pettit was on the staff on a part-time basis; his contribution was considerable and much appreciated; but if I were to plan for another summer, I would press hard to have him also as a full-time faculty member.

As for visiting speakers, I think that they should join an Institute for 3-4 days. We had originally contemplated such a policy, but budgetary restrictions forced us to cut down visits to two days. In my judgment, this is not sufficient to make a maximum contribution and to enter fully into the life of an Institute. I would rather have fewer visiting speakers and consultants, but keep them for a longer time. It is difficult to come into an Institute "cold" and do an optimum job.

With but few exceptions, our consultants made important contributions. I am glad we had them. At the same time, I see real merit in the suggestion advanced at Professor Westin's Institute in New York that, instead of scheduling such consultants ahead of time, one

have them "in reserve," ready to appear if their particular contributions are desired by the Institute participants. This could be achieved by presenting to the participants, during the first days of an Institute, a list of possible speakers, asking them to make the selections. In the case of local and regional consultants, I think this would work out. It might lead to some incomvenience and even awkwardness if some who had indicated their willinghess to come were not invited, but I think that would be a small price to pay if, by using this procedure, one could assure a greater voice for the participants in the conduct of the Institute.

We had too few persons of foreign background among the roster of visitors and consultants. A recommendation for all institutes in the area of international affairs would be to get speakers from embassies, consulates, foreign students, etc., representing different nations, cultures, and outlooks.

As Director of the Institute, I met repeatedly with my colleagues on the staff, both in preparation for the Institute and during the actual conduct of the Institute. I kept them completely informed of progress in arranging the program; I did not make important decisions concerning the program without consulting them. Our relationship was, and remains, personal and informal rather than highly structured; but since this was the keynote of the entire Institute, I believe that it is an appropriate relationship, especially in an institution of this kind. Therefore, for example, the degree of carry-over of Institute experience into the regular work of the staff members is their own business. I am convinced that there will be much such carry-over, but I have not made this a formal item on our agenda, nor do I think it is appropriate for me to do so.

I do think that the ratio of staff to participants is a significant factor in the success of an Institute. We had 6 2/3 staff members for 41 participants. I am pleased to see from the Evaluation Form (See Appendix 3 below) that without exception the participants felt that staff members were available to them for consultation, discussion, etc. All staff members attended the initial morning presentations; most of them stayed for the ensuing discussions; 2 staff members were in each of the Seminars; many staff members attended optional, co-curricular, extra-curricular, and social events. In my judgment, this is important. The participants are quite aware of who is there and who is not; rightly or wrongly, they use this as a criterion to judge interest and involvement. The high morale in our Institute is in no small measure attributable to the scope of participation on the part of the faculty - and this is obviously more possible when there is the kind of staff-participant ratio that we had than if our staff had been smaller.

4. Orientation Program

I attach hereto copies of the communications that we sent to participants prior to the opening of the Institute (See appendix 4). These communications were in the nature of information rather than invitations to a dialogue. They were sent to the participants prior to the beginning of the Institute. I feel that they should have served the function of preparing the participants for the Institute, and this feeling is shared by virtually all of them. As the results of the Evaluation Form below indicate (See Appendix 3), only one of the participants felt he did not fully know what to expect, while 39 were totally satisfied with this phase of Institute preparation.

There were a few participants who felt that we could have improved on the information we sent to them concerning housing accommodations in the city, etc. Some improvements can probably be made (such as sending them a map of the city, etc.), but some of their expectations and suggestions (e.g. getting them cheap apartments, together, in a single apartment complex, etc.) simply are not very realistic in a community such as Colorado Springs.

I find the suggestion that pre-Institute activities might have ensued in a dialogue an interesting one. Possibly if my earlier suggestion were implemented - namely that instead of a list of lecturers and consultants, the staff should prepare a listing of possible "inputs" and leave the selection to the participants - then some of this might already be subject of correspondence prior to the opening of the Institute.

One other phase of Institute orientation deserves comment. The first day, indeed the first hour, of an Institute seem to me to be very important in establishing a certain "tone" for the entire enterprise. I believe that we were able to establish the right tone here by the strong emphasis we placed on the "collegial" relationship we intended to establish, by the announcement of the absence of the usual pressures (tests, grades, preparations of "units," etc.) which would characterize our Institute. (As I shall note in more detail later, this policy did <u>not</u> reduce participant effort - the contrary was more nearly the case.)

Likewise, we took special pains to get as much "feedback" as possible from participants during the first week, so as to know their

expectations and their reactions to the Institute. We maintained a process for continuing feedback and evaluation throughout the Institute, but we were particularly anxious to initiate it very early.

5. Program Operation

In my initial presentation to the Institute participants, I set five goals for the Institute:

a. It was to be maximally useful to all participants;

b. It was to have a high, respectable intellectual content;

c. It was to demonstrate a thoroughly professional approach on everyone's part - participants and staff alike;

d. It was to be characterized by a warm and friendly personal relationship;

e. It was to have maximal "fall-out" effect, in the sense that we expected the participants to become "agents of change" not only in their own classrooms (this we would take for granted), but in their departments, schools, systems, and perhaps even states.

Let me comment on the achievement of these objectives in reverse order:

As to e. it is, of course, far too soon to tell. In fact, the results of last summer's Institute (1968) are just now becoming fully apparent. As part of this summer's Institute, we invited three of last year's participants to speak to the entire group on the ways in which they had applied their Institute experience during the school year. One of them, Mrs. Metcalf of Mitchell High School in

Colorado Springs, wrote a paper on the subject. In addition, another of last year's participants - one who had been very quiet and non-communicative during her six weeks with us, so that I really was quite uncertain of how the Institute had affected her - happened to write a letter which I received during the last week of this summer's institute, and which I distributed to the group. (Both papers are attached as Appendix 5). (It reinforces my previously-expressed opinion that verbal behavior is not the only criterion by which to judge these things). Many other communications of a similar nature have been received throughout the year.

Similarly, I would expect to hear from many of this summer's participants throughout the coming year on the ways in which they have applied Institute materials, concepts, ideas, data, etc. in their own situation. I have offered to serve as a "clearinghouse" for such information, sending it on to all other members of this year's group. Early in 1970, I will formalize this process through an official "questionnaire" letter; but I assume that this will be an ongoing process, in which I will involve the total of 86 participants who have been members of our two Summer Institutes.

As to d. Here I can be totally clear and unequivocal. The objective was attained. Without exception, I believe, the participants felt accepted and "at home" in the Institute. We suggested a first-name basis, not only among the par-

ticipants but also between participants and staff. We had pleasant, warm, congenial relationships. Short of a tension involving two of our members living in the "Institute House" on campus, there were not, to the best of my knowledge, frictions among the members. In part, the personal relationship was a function of the professional relationship, to which I will now turn, confident that my assessment of the achievement of this particular goal is accurate.

As to c. It is my judgment that, for the overwhelming majority of staff and participants, the Institute saw a demonstration of professionalism at its best. In large part, I attribute this to the absence of the usual academic superstructure - assignments open which tests would be given, assignments for specified performance, grades, etc. Instead, we encouraged the participants to pursue their own objectives, to engage in the types of activities that would have most "pay-off" for them. We asked them to do a certain amount of common reading for the Seminars and to attend the morning sessions and the seminars. All other functions of the Institute were optional.

I believe that the response was everything we could have hoped for. One of the members commented that this was the first time in his life as a teacher that he had been truly treated as a professional. My prediction was that, if approached that way, the participants would respond appropriately - and they did.

No doubt there were a few who relaxed perhaps a bit more than I might have found suitable - but I don't even want to be too definite on that point. Maybe some relaxation, some possibility to think and reflect, is what these persons most needed to make them better teachers. Most of them worked hard, read widely, discussed matters of mutual interest with one another and with members of the staff, had occasion to think about their own roles and competencies. All of them attended all sessions of the Institute regularly, and the attendance at optional sessions was invariably satisfactory; more than half of the members would attend any given event.

As to b. In my judgment, shared by my colleagues on the staff, the intellectual content of the Institute was on a high level. We did not "water down" material on the assumption that the participants would be unable to understand it if we failed to do so. We dealt with difficult issues, concepts, data, and we presented the materials as honestly and straightforwardly as we could. My own opinion is that the subject matter of international affairs is very complex. In the face of such complexity, there are only two alternatives: either one simplifies the subject so that it is more easily comprehensible - in the process often doing an injustice to the material itself; or else one tries to expand one's intellectual capacities so as to become capable of understanding the complexity of the subject. To a considerable extent, we did the latter - and asked the participants to do the same.

This is not an argument for "complexity for complexity's sake," and to the extent that simplified models and approaches manage to convey an accurate and inclusive picture of reality, one does just that, of course. But it is a recognition of the inherent difficulty of the subject matter itself.

I should add that, in my judgment, the majority of Institute members would have been offended had we taken another approach. Several of them throughout the Institute made comments to that effect. They felt that very frequently courses and programs in the Social Studies field "watered down" the material to such an extent that it became untrue, uninteresting, and uninspiring. They commended us for our refusal to do so. Some of them also indicated that in other Institutes in which they had either participated themselves or of which they had heard from others, a similar process went on; that the stress came to be placed on procedural and peripheral matters rather than on the tough subject matter which is, or should be, the core of a discipline.

Finally, as to a. It is difficult to talk in general terms about the usefulness of the Institute for all participants. One has to expect that different persons would find it differentially useful. Again, as in the case of Item e. above, I have a strong feeling that all the returns on this won't come in for a while - perhaps not for a year or

more . One of last year's participants who addressed this year's group pointed out that one of the assigned books last year had been his particular object of scorn during the Institute - but that he had found, during the year, that he used it, and referenced from it, more often than any other source - in short, he had changed his mind. I am not trying to evade the task of making judgment on the usefulness of the Institute. Opinions on the subject differ, both among the participants and the members of the staff. I do think, however, that it is fair for me to assert that a majority of both participants and staff members feel that the materials presented will be useful to teachers in their own classroom situations.

Certainly we made efforts to facilitate the application of materials to the classroom situation. The Associate Director of the Institute, Mr. Smith, feels that in this regard we were far ahead this year of compared to last year. A number of Institute programs were explicitly devoted to this task; it came up in virtually every discussion we had; in addition, from time to time I, as Institute Director, submitted my own notions of how a given body of material could be translated for actual classroom use. Professor East, who conducts a year-round program of service to Social Studies teachers at the University of Denver, was also particularly interested in this facet of the Institute. In short, I think that

we have a right to expect good returns from our efforts in this area.

In addition to the foregoing, let me comment specifically on some of the other questions raised in the Director's Handbook, p. 55:

a. Among the pedagogical techniques which we utilized in the Institute, the following deserve special mention:

1. Participants engaged in a 10=hr run of the INS Simulation, complete with full preparation, de-briefing, and consideration of its applicability in the High School classroom. Participants likewise participated in a brief "sample" run of the Foreign Policy Association's "Dangerous Parallel" Simulation. Information about other simulations was available on a special shelf in the Institute Resource Center.

2. One of the participants prepared a Slide Tape Show, to indicate to his colleagues how a given pedagogical point could be put across more effectively by the use of this method. This gave rise to lengthy and specific discussion concerning the formation of an Audio-Visual Media Center at a given High School, with important and feasible suggestions for implementation of such a plan.

3. There was demonstration for those interested in the preparation and use of slides as teaching aids.

4. Finally, a word should be set about the Resource Center which we established. It was located in a large room, where the Institute Secretary also had her desk. It contained the following materials:

a. A Library consisting of some 600 volumes, contributed by publishers, faculty members, and Institute participants themselves.

b. A table with lists of bibliographies on a large variety of subjects.

c. A Viet-Nam shelf.

d. A Middle East shelf.

e. Files from some 70 embassies and Information Services from that many countries.

f. Folders with articles, journals, and other materials relevant to the subject matter of the Institute.

g. A table of publisher's brochures for relevant books, also for films, and other teaching aids.

h. A display and printed material made available to us by the European Economic Community.

i. Materials provided by Institute participants, which we reproduced for everyone's information and use.

j. A selection of records, tapes, etc. (In addition, the Associate Director of the Institute kept a considerable number of films available for private or small-group screenings.)

All of the foregoing was in addition to the other ways of conveying the content, the subject matter, and its application to the High School situation. I attach, as Appendix 6, copies of each week's schedule of the Institute, which contains specific information on the topics covered.

b. I believe that informal programs, free-floating discussions, social events, the coffee breaks, lunches, etc. had a wholesome impact on the effectiveness of the program. Frequently I was reluctant, for example, to break up the coffee hour because it was so obvious to

me that some important conversations were taking place, and I made the judgment that these conversations were more valuable than the formal program which we had planned.

Similarly, the Apollo 11 program took place during the Institute, and we organized some of the Institute events arount it. I believe that the experience of watching man's first walk on the moon was one that none of us who enjoyed that experience together will ever forget; it created a mood and gave rise to informal discussions which were possibly among the most significant attributes of the Institute.

(See Appendix 6 for detailed Institute schedules for all six weeks) I am content with the beginning and ending dates of the Institute, even though the opening date presented difficulties for a couple of teachers from the Eastern part of the United States. I also feel that six weeks is an appropriate time for a Summer Institute. I would not lengthen it to eight weeks; I might consider shortening it to five, but on balance would be content to leave it as it is.

I think the program could have been improved by a further loosening of the structure of the Institute. Here we made considerable improvements over the previous summer; nonetheless, further improvements are possible and, in my opinion, advisable. (I attach, as Appendix 7, a document entitled "If I had to do it over again" which incorporates my recommendation on this point, together with other points). I agree with the evaluations of those members of the institute (participants and staff) who recommend fewer formal presentations, a greater variety of types of presentations, more open

time, etc. The experience of this summer and last summer persuades me that the additional open time would be well used by the participants, and that it would also enable the staff to engage in more informal and unstructured relationships with the participants than has been the case.

6. Evaluation

a. On the second day of the Institute, the Associate Director and I met with all participants who had attended previous Institutes, asking them to let us know the strengths and weaknesses of those previous experiences, so that we could benefit from this information. This was a very helpful session which affected our own approach greatly.

b. On the third day of the Institute, the Associate Director and I met with participants who had not previously attended Institutes, asking them to let us know their expectations and desires, so that we might accommodate ourselves to these to the best of our ability. Again, we found this useful.

c. At the end of the first, second and fourth weeks of the Institutes, we asked all participants to give us their views on the strong and weak points of the Institute. This evaluation, as an ongoing process, was carefully considered by us and shared with other members of the staff. A number of changes were made in the Institute program as a result of comments and recommendations thus submitted. Where certain recommendations could not be incorporated into the program, and where the forms were signed, we took pains to discuss the matter with the individual

who made the recommendation, telling him precisely what the difficulties were in trying to implement it. I have reason to believe that our careful attention to these evaluations was appreciated by the participants. Certainly their response to Question No. 31 on the final evaluation indicates high satisfaction.

d. Throughout the Institute, there were many informal contacts which generated ideas and suggestions and which provided opportunities for voicing complaints.

e. Finally, during the last week of the Institute, we asked participants to fill out very detailed evaluation forms, consisting of 48 questions, some of them open-ended. The results have been compiled and, in abbreviated form, constitute Appendix 3 to this report. I believe that the results speak for themselves and support the impression of very great satisfaction on the part of participants with the content and conduct of the Institute.

f. I have offered the services of my office to the participants for follow-up activities. Specifically, I have encouraged them to share their experiences in applying Institute-related materials in their classrooms with others, and have offered to reproduce and circulate reports of these experiences.

g. In addition, in January 1970, I will send a formal request for such reports to all members of the Institute, and in February, 1970 will distribute the responses I have received. I may decide to include the participants in the Summer 1968 Institute in this "round-robin" communication, as the subject mat ter of both Institutes was very similar. If there seems

to be a demand for this kind of service, I am prepared to extend it throughout the coming year and beyond. I believe that at the end of the coming academic year, it will be possible to be far more specific in the evaluation of long-range consequences of the Institute than it is now.

## III. Conclusions

Many of the answers to the questions posed in this section of the Director's Handbook (p. 56) are already contained in the foregoing materials. Here, a brief summing up may suffice.

Much more than in the preceding summer, we stressed the need for change, the expectation that participants - and staff members - would become "agents of change" not only in their own classrooms but in their home institutions as well. As far as the staff members are concerned, all but one of them had also been involved in the preceding Summer Institute. In a real sense, we were already "converts" to the approach which we had preached and practiced. All of us, I am sure, are far more aware of and sensitive to the need for interdisciplinary consideration of the subject of international relations. All of us, too, are much more aware of, and sensitive to, the particular needs and situations of our High School colleagues, and several of us are anxious to maintain the contact with them - a contact which we have found very beneficial. I expressed the view in my final discussion with this year's Institute members that many of them were without doubt better teachers than I and than many other College and University faculty I know - in terms of getting students involved, getting materials across to them, etc. This was not empty flattery; I meant it. We can learn much from each other.

One possible impact of this program on the host institution relates to a comprehensive plan for change that is currently being prepared here, under which we want to experiment with a system in which each teacher teaches and each student takes only one subject at a time. Our faculty colleague who is preparing this plan in his role as Faculty Assistant to the President is very interested in our own experience and findings during the summer. He has asked to have access to our files, evaluation sheets, and this final report. Opinion on both the merits and the feasibility of this particular plan differ, but my own feeling is that the experience of the Summer Institute would be an argument in favor of trying it.

Major Strengths and Weaknesses

The Institute's major strengths were as follows: 1. A professional rapport was established between College and High School faculty members, all of whom were engaged in a common learning situation centering on the transmission of materials, ideas, concepts, methods which will be applicable in the classroom (again, at both levels). 2. These materials, ideas, concepts and methods reltated to a subject of overriding importance and great seriousness. I can do no better than to cite a quotation from E. F. Penrose's THE REVOLUTION IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS; "That international relations are the most important aspect of human relations in our time; that their scope has expanded in many directions since the Second World War; and that on their future course the survival of the human race depends, is hardly open to dispute." 3. Another strength of the Institute was the great amount of interaction and exchange among Institute members themselves and also involving the staff. The physical setting of the Institute contributed to this. Most of our discussions took place in an attractive lounge, facilitating free and relaxed

exchange of views. About half of the participants lived on campus, in a fraternity house (which we re-named "Institute House"). This house provided very favorable conditions for close personal contacts. The Living Room was used frequently for co-curricular events, (discussions, etc.) and a well-stocked refrigerator was no detriment to the success of the Institute.

As part of this exchange among Institute members, no less than 25 sets of materials embodying teaching units, suggestions, ideas, sample forms, etc. were submitted by the participants and reproduced for the use of all other members of the Institute. In addition, the faculty provided more than a dozen sets of similar materials. The participants joked about having to buy trailers to carry these teaching suggestions home with them, but I know that they appreciated the availability of these materials. 4. Another aspect of the Institute on which we received many favorable comments was that either the Institute Director or someone else made it a practice to take notes of all lectures and other presentations, distributing these notes to the participants on the next day. This made it unnecessary for each member of the Institute to take his or her own notes; it made it possible for all to listen to the presentations and to enter fully into the discussions, without feeling pressed to take down every priceless word. I recommend the procedure highly - several of us plan to use it in our classes in the future.

The major weaknesses of the Institute were: 1. that in spite of our efforts to loosen the schedule, it was still more structured than it should have been; 2. that we perhaps tried to do too much and would have been better off concentrating on fewer areas of concern (except that this is difficult to do in a field as broad as international affairs and as applicable to many High School courses); 3. that for some of

the participants the assigned readings and consideration of certain topics, primarily in one of the Seminars, seemed not immediately germane to their needs; 4. that we failed to do more with films.

Reasons for successes and failures:

The reasons for the first "strength" mentioned above - the professional rapport - is, in my judgment, clearly traceable to the absence of the ordinary pressures and compulsions which characterize the educational process at all levels. We had high expectations and expressed them, but we did not enforce behaviors which might lead to their fulfillment. They were fulfilled anyhow; if anything, more so than they would have been had we pursued a different approach. Secondly, the participants realized the significance of the subject we were addressing; the potentialities for good or evil that resided in it; and they rose to the challenge of learning as much as they could about the field. The reasons for the other "strengths" cited are self-explanatory.

The reasons for the weaknesses are harder to trace. 1. We ended up with more outside speakers (and more of them from the College itself) than I had first planned, thus leading to some overstructuring. Part of the reason for this was that I invited two of the faculty members who had first been scheduled as full-time staff members in the Institute, but who had to be cut because of budgetary problems (See p. 4 above). I thought that asking them to give a couple of presentations to the group was about the least I could do to ease the bad taste of having first been hired and then let go! In all fairness, I ought to add that, in programming, I have a tendency toward overstructuring - a tendency which I am fighting, but not yet with total success.

2. Another problem is that the contribution of Sociology to International Relations is perhaps more difficult to define and to understand than is the case of Economics and Political Science. Hence, in Appendix 7 I am suggesting that in future Institutes we abandon a separate Sociology Seminar and perhaps substitute one in International Relations/ Foreign Policy per se. I would not, however, wish to exclude the considerable contribution which Sociology and Social Psychology can make to a better understanding of international relations processes. 3. With respect to films, I think the reason for our shortcoming here was that we started only after other parts of the program were already set; in the future (if there is to be a future for this kind of enterprise), I suggest reversing the sequence and start by planning a program of films and other media. One of the participants suggested an "IR Film Festival" day, and I think that is a splendid idea. I should add that a considerable number of participants did view films and, at our suggestion, wrote up their reactions and evaluations. These were compiled and distributed, and participants considered this document to be particularly valuable.

Most significant aspects in the judgment of the participants.

The participants felt that detailed and concentrated exposure to information about international affairs and about the similarities and varieties of systems in the world was the most significant aspect of this Institute. Many of them came to the Institute with very vague and unsatisfactory background in the field. No one expected them to become "specialists" in six short weeks, but I believe - and, more importantly, they believe - that they have been exposed to an area of great concern which was previously a closed book for many of them; that they are going to be better teachers because of this; and that they are going to try to persuade athers among their colleagues of the significance of improving the teaching of international affairs in the High Schools of our country.

Unique features and their contribution to the attainment of Institute objectives.

I have not really thought about this as a "unique feature," but quite probably it was: namely, the collegial atmosphere, the idea of a common learning situation involving all of us, the informality which linked rather than separated participants from staff, and the absence of compulsions. As I have clearly expressed earlier, I feel strongly that these features of the Institute contributed greatly to the attainment of the objectives which we had set for ourselves.

Finally, what did we really accomplish in our program?

We helped 41 High School Social Studies teachers, from 21 states of the Union to gain a deeper understanding of contemporary international relations, of the problems and potentialities which reside in the coexistence of over 130 different states, with varying histories, customs, value patterns, and political, social, and economic institutions and processes. We succeeded - certainly in most cases, and perhaps in all - to impress upon these fine teachers the importance of sound, solid teaching of this subject as part of their regular teaching in other Social Studies fields. We stressed the need both to "infiltrate" international materials into other courses, and to add units and courses in the subject itself. We persuaded them of the desireability, indeed the necessity, for being "agents of change" in their own schools, their communities, districts, and states. Together, we learned a lot which is bound to have great, if not precisely measurable, consequences in the years ahead.

Every human effort is to some degree imperfect. Ours certainly was. But I am content that it was good and that, on balance, the achievements greatly outweight the shortcomings. My colleagues on the



t

staff join with me in being grateful for the chance to be involved in this effort. I believe that I can also say the same for our 41 colleagues from the High Schools. On the basis of their own testimony, they too felt that they participated in a significant experience.

Fred A. Sondermann
Director

## APPENDIX 3

## SUMMARY OF FINAL EVALUATION FORMS

Since it would be difficult to reproduce the results of all the final evaluation forms in their "raw" state, the following briefer recapitulation is submitted:

A. Preparation for the Institute

1. 39 participants felt that they were adequately informed on the various aspects of the Institute prior to its opening. Such comments as "beautiful," "Thoughtful," "tremendous job," "outstanding information" were applied to this phase of the Institute.

   1 member answered negatively, saying he was not prepared for quite so much structured presentation, and that it took him a couple of weeks to get acclimated.

2. 35 members answered affirmatively to the question whether the communications they received were adequate in preparing them for the Institute and living in Colorado Springs. 2 answered negatively, and 3 were ambivalent on the subject.

   The major complaint of the 5 who were not affirmative related to housing. They felt the housing information for those living in town was not as helpful as they would have liked it to be.

B. The Morning Sessions of the Institute

3. 15 members found the morning sessions extremely useful
   24 members found them quite useful
   1 thought they were all right
   1 thought they were not very useful

   There were some comments on too much theoretical materials in the lectures. A number commented that the discussions following the presentations were usually beneficial.

4. 22 members thought it would have been useful to make some general reading assignments for the morning sessions. 17 members answered negatively to this suggestion, and 1 did not know.

5. As for the length of the morning sessions, all 40 who turned in questionnaires thought this was about right, neither too long nor too short. (Our first unanimity!)

6. In terms of preferences for approaching the morning sessions, a clear majority - 23 - liked the lecture-discussion sequence. 6 opted for only lectures; 3 for only discussions; and the remainder made a variety of suggestions. One commented that when good lecturers were up, they should be given full scope for their talents; but that at other times, different techniques should be used.

   There was a variety of suggestions for the conduct of the morning sessions. Several members felt that three or four such sessions per week were sufficient. Some suggested that discussion groups be smaller. There was a body of feeling that the "lecture" format had been overdone and that different styles should be employed.

7. 18 members would have favored a tighter organization of subject matter for the morning sessions (e.g. one week each for Sociology, Economics, Political Science, etc.), while 22 members felt that the looser structure was more congenial.

8. Conversely, only 5 members would have preferred a looser organization of the subject matter, while 29 preferred it the way it was.

9. 5 members would have preferred more time for discussion in the morning sessions, 2 opted for less time, while 32 thought it was about right the way we had it.

10. 1 member would have preferred more participation by faculty members in the morning discussions, 8 would have liked less such participation, 31 members thought it was about right the way it was.

11. 2 members thought the coffee break was too long, 4 that it was too short, and 34 that it was about right.

12. The consensus was that the morning sessions had been useful, and that their usefulness could have been even greater had more attention been paid to the concrete applications of the materials to the classroom; that less emphasis on lectures and more on short presentations, films, and other media of communications would also have enhanced this part of the institute.

C. <u>The Seminars</u>

13. 10 members felt that the Seminars had been extremely useful; 16 that they had been quite useful, 12 that they had been all right, and 1 that they had not been very useful.

    To the extent that distinctions were made, the Economics Seminar was generally considered to have been most useful, followed by the Political Science Seminar, followed by the Sociology Seminar. Special mention was made of the topics that were discussed in Economics, which were directly relevant to the needs of classroom teachers; and to the materials that were distributed in the Political Science Seminar that made learning easier in that they focused attention on certain important questions.

14. 22 members felt that some time in all seminars should have been devoted to more fundamental aspects of the respective fields, while 16 disagreed. There were some comments to the effect that this problem had been solved best in the Economics Seminar, in which the instructor had permitted the participants to structure the seminar in terms of subject matter to be discussed.

15. 17 members felt that the seminar reading assignments had been too long, 23 felt that they had been about right. No one felt that they had not been long enough. Suggestions were made for choosing articles (like Heilbroner in Sociology), and reprints from the Bobbs-Merrill series.

16. See Question 13. above for evaluations of the usefullness of various seminars. The reasons given for these evaluations varied - from previous acquaintance with the subject, competence in it, need for it, materials covered, attitudes, and conduct of the seminars.

17. 38 members felt that seminar instructors had been tolerant of different opinions; no one answered negatively, but 2 members raised some doubts. There was a feeling that, while no "intolerance" was involved, certain questons and points of view had been "turned off" in one of the Seminars, leading to a breakdown in communication.

18. In an almost-even split, 19 members would have preferred a separate seminar in History, while 20 members opted against this. The opposition was based mostly on the consideration that most seminars involved History and that most participants had a strong History background and needed other subjects more.

19. 25 members would have liked to see a seminar in International Relations as a separate offering; 13 opted against it (on the grounds that all seminars were more or less related to IR).

20. Opinions on books that were used is best presented in tabular form:

| | Very useful | Fair | Not very useful |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Political Science** | | | |
| Ward | 44% | 51% | 5% |
| Mendel | 55% | 37% | 8% |
| Lipset | 65% | 33% | 2% |
| **Economics** | | | |
| Heilbroner | 92% | 8% | |
| Wilcox | 70% | 24% | 6% |
| Novack/Kekachman | 31% | 55% | 14% |
| Schwartz | 55% | 42% | 3% |
| **Sociology** | | | |
| Drucker | 55% | 33% | 12% |
| Horowitz | 31% | 33% | 36% |
| Pfeffer | 48% | 45% | 7% |

21. Numerous general comments on the seminars were made. Some felt that they were too long and could have beencut to an hour or so. Some felt that participants should have done more than listen; should have entered more fully into the discussion. A strong recommendation was made to abandon readings that were required for everyone and substitute a problems approach, for which every member would come prepared with his own prior reading.

D. Other Institute Programs - Curricular

22.a. Although this can become a matter of some embarrassment (in either direction), we did feel it important to ask for an evaluation of the faculty. The results will become part of the permanent record of the Institute and will be communicated to persons intending to submit future proposals for additional institutes, for their information and guidance.

It is appropriate to say here that the results indicate a high level of satisfaction with the contribution made by most of the faculty members involved in this year's institute.

22.b. With respect to lecturers and consultants, there is a wider spread of opinion. Several (especially Messrs. Von Laue, McLaughlin, Loevy, and Brooks) received quite high ratings. On some others, opinion was rather widely dispersed; and for only two was the evaluation more on the negative than on the affirmative side. Again, this will be part of the permanent Institute record and will be communicated to future directors.

23. 26 members felt that the Resource Center was very valuable, while 14 felt that it was good, but of limited value. No one felt that it was detrimental or unnecessary.

Among comments made, several referred to the Institute Secretary whose office was located in the room, and who was very helpful to the Institute members. A frequent comment was that the Resource Center would have been even more valuable if some specific assignments had been made, if the seminars had been restructured so as to avoid generally assigned readings and turn members loose on topics and problems, and also if more time had been available to utilize the Resource Center fully.

27. It seems appropriate to include answers to Question #27 here, as it ties in with the foregoing. 29 members felt that the materials available in the Resource Center for the permanent use of participants were very valuable; 10 felt they were of limited value. Several commented that these materials would add to the resource centers of their own schools, that some would be reordered for classroom research.

24. As to the materials that were distributed to the members in the morning sessions, 1 member felt that this had been "too much of a good thing," 3 felt that they were mixed, and 36 felt that they were very helpful. One commented that this was a very strong point of the institute, another that the materials would be used very extensively, and several commended the Institute staff for providing these materials.

25. 23 members felt that the Simulation had been a good use of time; 1 that it had been a waste, 1 that it was fair, and 4 raised questions. 5 indicated that they had not participated. There were some comments to the effect that a variety of simpler games would have been more appropriate than the complex INS Simulation. Several members aaid that they would use this simulation or others in the future.

26. Opinions on the film program were mixed. 11 felt that it made an important contribution (commenting especially on the evaluation sheets, which were considered valuable, 4 felt it was unnecessary, and 9 felt that it could have contributed more if some of the films had been shown in morning sessions, if they had been scheduled more definitely, if they had been more readily available on week-ends and during free time.

26. On the structure of the Institute, 4 felt it was too highly structured, 1 that it was insufficiently structured, and 35 were satisfied that it was about right in its scheduling of various events.

29. As for other types of curricular or co-curricular activities that might have been included, only 13 members responded, which may be interpreted as a sign of relative satisfaction on the part of the others. Answers included: more controversial presentations; more emphasis on actual U.S. foreign policy; on China; on curriculum reform; a speaker from the State Department; films on simulation; presentation of actual teaching units; more "group production;" history of U.S. foreign policy. One even suggested a trip to the State Penitentiary as a possible beneficial event for those teaching government and problems courses.

30. 39 members responded that the faculty were available for private discussion whenever the need was felt. No one responded negatively to this.

31. 34 members felt that their comments and suggestions were very much welcomed. 3 felt that they were accepted, but not (always) implemented. No one felt that comments and suggestions were resented by the staff. One wrote "I think everyone here felt very much at ease from the good rapport that was established the first few days."

32. As for general comments concerning the organizational and co-curricular aspects of the Institute, 14 members commented. Of these three or four were somewhat critical of certain aspects - they felt, for instance, that more historical and cultural material should have been introduced, that participants were placed in too passive a role, that at times the schedule had become crowded, that people from entirely different cultures should have been given more space in the Institute (and that the mail service on campus had been unsatisfactory). All other comments were laudatory, capped by this one: "No comments. I am one happy participant. I hate to leave. Can't we extend this for another 30 or 40 years?"

E. Other Institute Programs - Extracurricular

33. Only 4 members would have liked to have additional social events for the entire group. 35 expressed the feeling that what there was was good and sufficient.

34. However, for those who brought their families and lived in town, 9 said that their wives and children would have enjoyed more organized group events, whereas 8 indicated satisfaction with what they had. Numerous suggestions for additional family events were submitted.

35. To the question whether there were enough informal, spontaneous social contacts among Institute members, 24 said "yes" for those living on campus, with no "no's" registered; 17 answered affirmatively for those living off campus, but here 9 thought that there had not been enough. (Note: Some checked both the on-campus and off-campus category.) The feeling seems to have been that those living in the Institute House had more "fun" than those living in town.

36. 12 would have liked more get-togethers in the evening to discuss matters of common interest, 26 would not have liked these.

37. 19 of those living on campus were satisfied with their living arrangements; 1 raised some doubts short of real dissatisfaction. Of those living in town, 10 were satisfied with their living arrangements, 3 were dissatisfied, mostly on the score of expense for suitable living accommodations.

38. Second item of unanimity: All 40 who returned questionnaires were satisfied with the food served on campus. One commented that he or she gained 12 lbs. during the summer!

39. Only three would have liked to participate in sports events other than those that were offered; 36 members answered negatively.

40. 7 of the members attended other campus events such as movies, concerts, lectures, theater, etc. frequently, 19 attended occasionally, 9 seldom, and 5 never. The "seldoms" and "nevers" were mostly those with families in town.

41. To the invitation to make other comments concerning extra-curricular events, 14 members responded. Of these 11 commented favorably, 3 made some additional suggestions - hiking groups, use of the campus gym, etc.

F. General Evaluation

42. 7 members felt that certain subjects in the Institute might have been eliminated from consideration; 30 felt that this was not the case. Among those "nominated" for elimination were Sociology, Methodology, Stratification, North and South American race relations, Political Theory, and the presentations on East Asian problems.

43. On the other hand, 15 felt that there were subjects to which the Institute did not specifically address itself which, in their judgment, should have been dealt with. While 23 felt differently, and were satisfied with the coverage, the specific suggestions of the 15 included: Differences in domestic viewpoints on American foreign policy; cultural studies, failures of foreign policy, diplomacy, actual American foreign policies, contemporary foreign relations problems, comparative cultural values, the conduct of foreign policy, psychology, international law, the role of the military in international affairs, China, disarmament, International Law, Philosophy.

44. 8 members felt that certain subjects were overemphasized in the Institute, while 28 members disagreed. Of those who felt that there was some over-emphasis, the following were listed: Third World, Marxist-Leninist Theory, Development; Marxism, Models, Vietnam, History, Social Stratification, Ideology, Integration, U.S.-Soviet relations.

45. 13 members felt that certain subjects were <u>under</u>-emphasized, while 24 were content with the emphasis as it stood. Among those subjects listed as having not been stressed sufficiently were: Cultural Studies, International Economics, Middle East and Asia; Conduct of foreign policy; China; Psychology, International Law.

46. To the question "If you had to eliminate one aspect of the institute, in a quest for better distribution of total time, which one could have been most easily dispensed with, a wide variety of answers ensued. Some declined to say, including one who wrote "Why eliminate anything?" Several mentioned Sociology; others nominated all the Seminars, certain of the optional presentations, some of the morning lectures, the coffee break, the discussions. Obviously there was no consensus on this question, and perhaps it was not a good question.

47. The same is true of the question which asked for suggestions as to what aspects of the Institute might have been curtailed rather than eliminated. The same subjects were cited as in the foregoing questions, but without any clear pattern that would indicate widespread agreement on any one of them.

48. 6 members would have liked to have written assignments, 31 preferred it the way it was, and 2 were undecided. Some suggestions for a written assignment included a brief paper investigating some aspect of IR, ar area of concentration, book reviews (which could presumably be shared with the entire group,) review tests, regular tests. However, the vast majority felt that one of the strong points of the Institute was the very fact that there were no such assignments. Much was done on the members' own initiative, and one of them wrote "Leave it that way. Encourage, but do not require" production.

Finally, 32 of the members responded to the invitation to write general comments that were not fully included in all the other answers. Overwhelmingly, the tone was friendly, and the suggestions well-taken. It is not possible to reproduce all of these answers, as they run to many pages. I hope that the following is a fair and representative sample; though I reproduce some of them with a bit of personal embarrassment about the comments made of my role. But it is better to do this than to edit, and no editing was involved in any of these:

"In the foregoing pages, I have engaged in a nit-picking process which might lead the casual reader to believe that the institute had more that was wrong than good with it. On the contrary, I must say that this has probably been the most important six-week period in my academic career. I am impressed with Mickey East's concept of infiltration, and when I return to my school this fall, I will attempt to employ that technique and show my colleagues how to do it as well. While I previously believed that I was an "internationally-minded" person, I have come to see this summer that my perspective was shallow and my comprehension was incomplete. I have become

aware of IR as a discipline for intellectual growth, and of the tremendous complexity and tenuity of international relations. I intend to spend the balance of my summer dealing with the question of how to convey some of the ideas and attitudes developed here to my colleagues. They will be much tougher nuts to crack than the students, but the students, too, must learn some of what we have learned here. Many thanks for broadening my perspectives and expanding my narrow attitudes."

"I should like to take this time to express my gratitude for allowing me to participate. I have found this institute most stimulating and rewarding. As I have made it known, to some, I am deeply concerned in the field of IR. I feel most troubled and frustrated that I have not been able to convince others of the necessity of including this even in my own High School. An institute such as this gives me hope that I will some day be able to accomplish more than I have. I have heard some people say that they are disturbed by the pessimism expressed in many of the presentations. If this is true then there is hope, for, being disturbed, they may be stirred the more action than they are presently taking. Perhaps this is something which you can do. I have the feeling that with more push in the direction of getting these teachers to push themselves, we will be in a better position of moving toward world peace. For your part, you can emphasize the idea that these teachers can do something - - this is supposedly why they are here (at least I interpret it that way). In other words, this institute should be more than personal edification. For me, it should be a springboard to further action. . . . ."

"This has been a valuable experience and a stimulating institute. The readings were well selected and will be very useful in classroom work. Discussions are not my strong point since I like a carefully planned and structured approach. Memory can be faulty. Nevertheless, they serve a good purpose and do bring a group closer together.
The program has served to bring some adjustments in courses to be prepared, primarily with some new emphases."

"No new criticism - just a sincere thank you for allowing me to participate. I am sure that more than gratitude, you would appreciate the sincere statement that the institute will be put to good use in the schools represented by the participants. Speaking for myself (and I am sure most of the others) your program has done much to increase our IR knowledge, and every effort will be made to implement that knowledge in a specific IR program, or at the very least in the subject matter of our standard presentations."

"In my estimation, everything went off in clockwork order. Things were somewhat crowded for a time, but it is much better that way than having too much time off. The institute was most valuable to me. Some of the exchanges of ideas were most beneficial:
1. teaching techniques
2. added materials to the classroom
3. ways and means of making teaching more interesting
4. making the atmosphere of the classroom more inviting to the student."

"I am very pleased with this experience. Institutes cannot be all things to all people, but you have come as close as possible. "T&FN's" were extremely worthwhile. I could go on and on, but I think it all can go back to the atmosphere created and the sincerity of the staff. Thanks a lot."

Note: "T&FN's" stands for "Tentative and Fallible Notions" regarding application of materials to classroom situation - a series of papers prepared by the Institute Director after some of the presentations.

"I thoroughly enjoyed the institute and was very grateful for the opportunity to attend. I was most impressed by the participation of the staff members in each other's activities. The program was valuable to the participants and did not lapse into pedagogical nothingness which frequently mars inservice programs for teachers. Also, I feel the contacts of people from different areas of the U.S. adds to the value of the institute. Thank you very much for this valuable and most pleasant experience."

"I believe that the most significant and sustaining element throughout the Institute was the apparent awareness of the faculty and staff to make the lectures and materials relevant for high school teaching. Moreover, in my judgment, the Institute's program to study in some depth international comparative systems was fulfilled. The careful and thoughtful selection of faculty members, consultants, and most lecturers was the most important contribution to the success of the Institute."

"I have been extremely pleased with the Institute. I have indicated a couplr of areas that were deserving of criticism, but these were not sufficient to take away from the overall excellence of the program. (Corrections in these areas would, of course, make the Institute even better).
One suggestion I would make that might have some value and be worth considering has to do with Staff training and/or orientation. Since the Institute is aimed at improving the proficiency of high school teachers, it would be good if the staff made a concerted effort to become more familiar with the secondary school classroom and general teaching situation. I would suggest visitations during the upcoming school year to local high schools. This would help some.
But better yet, why not try an exchange program for maybe a week with a local high school social studies teacher. Scheduling would be difficult because you would have to find someone with a high degree of competence in the areas you are trying to cover in you classes that week, etc. But it could be done if the effort were made with enthusiasm by both the college professor and the H.S. teacher.
If this were done by most, or preferably all, of the staff members before your next Institute, you would have a better "feel" for the participants' situation and problems and could relate the materials of the Institute better.
I don't want you to gfeel that this is a criticism of the present staff - it definitely is <u>not</u>. The suggestion I have made would probably be of more benefit to the staff than to the participants - if for no other reason than that they would now have more empathy for the people they are working with and more confidence in what they are doing."

"The Institute has been interesting, informative, broadening, inspiring for the following reasons:
1. Your rorganizational ability is superb.
2. You and all the staff (with perhaps one exception) were so eager to be helpful, interested, in all.
3. The faculty, as a whole, are so well-informed and were so well-prepared.
4. Nothing seemed too much for anyone. All were so generous with their time and talents.

You will be glad to know that I think I can use much of the subject-matter in one way or another. (Even if I can't put it to immediate use, I'm sure it all adds up to our "store" of knowledge.)
1. as a member of the Committee for Revision of the Syllabus in Senior Social Studies, I think I can be instrumental in broadening the Economics syllabus to include problems as well as principles, and a comparison of types of world economies.
2. In the political science syllabus, there is a unit on foreign policy, trade, and aid which I'm sure can be made more meaningful.
3. I shall try to have many of the books and other materials added to our Social Science Department's resource center.
4. I am anxious to try some of the ideas in methods I got especially for presentation - e.g. simulation.

Thank you very much for all.

"The Institute has been very enjoyable and enlightening to me. I have felt it has been time well spent. I have particularly found the last half of the Institute of most value. I am one who will "infiltrate" IR into my classwork, I think it applies in too many areas to have simply a "unit" on it. I think we all have appreciated the friendliness and help of the faculty and have learned much that will help in our classrooms. My thanks especially to Fred for his intermediary role and directorship. Many thanks."

"The format of the Institute was excellent. I felt, generally, that lectures and discussions were most worthwhile. Seminars were perhaps of least value. I think here is where some restructuring should occur. I felt the outside speakers were generally good!
Dr. S. is one great guy. He is a tremendously <u>human</u> man. He possesses a great practical sense, having descended long ago from the Ivory tower; yet a fertile and imaginative mind.
Truly, this has been a worthwhile Institute for me. I am returning to my school armed with new material, new ideas, and a broad new outlook on a great field of study. Thank you for six magnificent weeks!"

Note: All other comments are on file at the Institute office and are available to anyone wishing to review them. The original evaluation forms are being kept, as are a series of recaps on individual questions.

APPENDIX 5 - Feedback from previous year's participants

Notes from Presentation to the EPDA Institute in International Affairs - July 23, 1969

Fay Metcalf

Before I tell you how important the Institute was to me as a teacher, I would like to tell you of the impact that it had on my personal life. I was born and reared in North Dakota, which is not exactly a hot bed of internationalism. I was dandied on the knee of Gerald Nye, who as you remember was the Senator who was a notorious isolationist--out of favor for a long time, but now the darling of the neo-isolationists. He was a close friend of my father's, and even two years ago my father was still referring to himself as a Stalwart. I cried all the way to the polls, but I voted for Barry Goldwater. I did, make on excursion into the realm of international relations right after World War II, when foreign students were flooding the campus of the University of North Dakota. My borhter and I started an International Relations Club. We had as our first big speaker, Alger Hiss, but when he was indicted a few months later, I was disenchanted with internationalism. I did take a few courses in foreign policy, and I did read the New York Times Sunday edition so that I could keep somewhat abreast of current affairs, but I was in no sense a person seriously interested in International Relations. My compulsive concern with International Relations began last summer, and I suspect that it will be permanent change in my interests. My reading habits have changed dramatically and certainly my teaching has.

I was very lucky that there were three people from our world history teaching team who were participants in the Institute. As it happened, we three were also the unit writers for our school and later for a district wide curriculum revision. We had already taught by the conceptual approach using the inquiry-reflective method. Last year we tried to incorporate some IR materials, but our really big change came this spring, after we had had a year to try a few things out and some time to reflect on what we had learned last summer. To show you how much our units have changed, let me just list the titles of our units. Two years ago, our units were Historiography, the Ancient World, the Classical World, the Medieval World, the Transition period, the Nineteenth Century, and the Twentieth Century. The only real attention that we paid to the non-West was through the study of Imperialism, and that from the point of view of the West. Last year our units were Historiography, the Ancient and Classical Worlds, with some attention to the civilizations of not only the Nite and the Tigris-Euphrates, but also of the Hwang-Ho and the Indus, the Transition Period--with attention to the religions of the non-Western world as well as the West, the Nineteenth Century--Europe, and the Twentieth Century, in which we did attempt to be a bit more global. Our latest attempts at unit writing were vastly different, and these city-wide units show a great deal of infusion of Institute-derived ideas and materials. Our unit titles now are: Historiography and Georgraphy, The Non-Western World, The Nineteenth Century (Global), and the Twentieth Century (Global).

Our title course is now taught from the base of five major concepts. The ones we have chosen are taken from Barbara Ward's Five Ideas That Changed the World. We study Nationalism from its modern beginnings with the Napoleonic era to World War I. We then look at Industrialism which leads into Colonialism and Communism, and tie all these threads together with Internationalism.

To give you an example of the type of unit we teach, I'll give you a brief summary of our Non-Western study. We start out with the World Mindedness quiz, which we use as a motivational gimmik. The students really enjoy this--this are self-graded by the students and not even picked up by the teacher--and it provides a great springboard for discussion of such concepts as ethnocentrism and the difficulty of getting into someone else's cultural envelope (Dr. Von Laue's idea, which I'm sure you all know too). We then divide the classes into pairs, groups, or whatever, to study seven different areas: China, Japan, India, Southeast Asia, the Middle East, Africa south of the Sahara, and regions of Latin America. We center the study of these cultures on problems of food, the economic influences on society. The students look at population, poverty, geographic influences, climate, cultural biases, and labor techniques. After these things have been researched and understood by the students, we look at religion-philosophy, expressive arts, social and political institutions. We then look at the impact of Imperialism on the traditions of these socieities. We examine the motives of the imperialists, using primary documents, and the response of the native peoples. We use statistics which the students examine to see if colonies really paid, and when in some cases it is proved that they did not, the students research to find other motives. We find the pamphlets from Viewpoints in World History by Bernard Feder expecially useful for this, since they are well chosen primary documents which are exiciting, and which are easy enough reading for our slower students. We use as an evaluating device for this part of the unit a form of role-playing. One half of the class writes letters as if they were imperialists addressing the colonical peoples, and explaining the benefits to the native peoples that imperialism has brought. The rest of the class writes letters to the imperialists explaining why they don't want Western control. Some of these letters are read aloud in class and they have been the inspiration for some very heated discussions--almost fist to fist involvement! We then use "Applying the Concept of Imperialism" which the students work out before class, and discuss in class. This has been very useful for explaining the various kinds of imperialism, especially if the teach[illegible]ses analogies and turns the tables on some of the examples given. There is not attempt to arrive at a consensus with this. Probably no attitudes are changed by the exercise, but the students do gain a better understanding of why they hold their own opinions.

Imperialism caused some problems of transition for these societies, and these are now examined. How had Western influence changed the religions of the areas? Can the change be discerned in a comparison of the expressive arts? Japan and Western Africa show this very clearly and we use community resource people who do a really good job on this. We also look at the changed position of women in the societies, and the changes in governmental forms. We have each student read a piece of fiction from the area he has studied. This is something written by a native of the area. A good example is Kamala Taylor's Nectar in a Sieve. This novel shows a woman's acceptance of the traditional society--the monsoon does not come and her child dies of starvation which she accepts with resignation since this is the way of things--but then industrialism hits her village, a tannery is built, and the whole way of life changes. Students can identify very well with this sort of book and it is a good way for them to attempt getting into someone else's cultural envelope. We have arranged with the English department so that the students get double credit for these book reports.

In our Twentieth Century unit we again pick up nationalism, its revival and its conflict with tribalism. Through a study of the cold war we take another look at Communism and Colonialism and the relationships between Communism and Nationalism and between Communism and Industrialism. We have student-presented panels on the questions of "Nationalism is the greatest threat to world peace," and "A planned economy is the fastest way for thrid world countries to industrialize." These really produced excitement among the students, and some really hot and heavy research went into their preparation for the presentation. It was here that the students really determined that socialism is an economic system, not a political system.

The students were convinced now that modernization was necessary for the third world. To help them identify the concept of modernization (another spin-off of the Institute was getting to hear Jerry Moore present this idea) we used ideas garnered from "Modernization: A Conceptual Approach to Asian Studies," by Bob Henderson and Jerry Moore in Social Education, November, 1968. From this presentation the students learned to define and generalize about modernity, to use social indices to measure modernity, and to apply such new knowledge to areas other than Asia.

At this point each student chooses one third-world country to research in depth. After he is thoroughly familiar with all aspects of his country, he tries to determine the influences the five ideas have or have not had on his country. Each student is given a copy of the "Decision Making in Foreign Policy" sheet, which helps him a great deal with his final assignment which is to offer an hypothesis on the future of his country. Just the other day one of my students came to me with tears in her eyes and being very upset over the assassination of Tom Mboya. She had felt that the was a solid leader of his country and would help guide it to a productive future. I doubt very much if such involvement would have occurred if she had only read a textbook account of Kenya.

Toward the end of the year a continuous progress unit in Law and Society is offered to the students and they study the development of law, the concepts of social contract, natural law, and the inevitable conflicts between law and rights. They look at Nuremburg as an example of international law and deal with some of the problems of international law, i.e., space, war. They then try to develop an organization which will be capable of handling such problems. Until this time, their study of the UN has only been incidental to the other readings that they have done. They begin now to study it in some depth as part of the last section of the Twentieth Century unit which is "Is Peace Possible."

You will see that much of this is pure Mickey East, although the material is used in a manner quite unlike the way Mickey produced it. You will see from the motivational devices that our concern is still empathy rather than tolerance, and that we want very graphically for the students to see that many of the problems of the world stem directly from the disparity between the have and the have not nations. The "Ten Minutes to Peace" pre and post test which is given is from the Institute for International Order, and many of the other materials from the World Law Fund, an organization I had not even heard of before the Institute.

The unit follows rather naturally from the previous study, but the real inspiration came from Fred, who remarked one day that we spend a lot of time teaching our students about war, but very little time teaching them about peace. This remark rattled around my brain during most of the winter, and in looking at our previous curriculum, I found that it was quite true. This unit has not been taught yet, and there will no doubt have to be some changes, but we can hardly wait until next year to try it.

There were other, less obvious, fall outs from the Institute. We held a week long symposium this year which was open to all students of the school--all 2,200 or so of them, and this was so well received that it will be a total school affair next year. Our principal was most enthusiastic about the success of it and plans for it to be an annual affair. The topic of concentration will change from year to year of course, but you can be sure that it will always have some sort of international bent.

Some of the materials that we have found especially useful for the students were Heilbroner which we read in the Economics seminar, Lipset from the Sociology section, and Findley from the Political Science seminar. We have also done a little bit with simulation.

Probably the most important gain, however, has not been materials, ideas, or greater knowledge. The fact that there were three of us involved made all the difference. The rapport between the three of us has increased and when we sit down to write curriculum, we continually reinforce one another's ideas. I doubt very much if we would have seen so many changes had there been only one of us involved.

As you can see, the Institute had a tremendous impact on a personal level and on a professiona level. It was an outstanding summer, and I certainly hope that other teachers will have the opportunity to take part in such an exciting and stimulating experience.

7/25/69

From: Fred Sondermann
To: Institute Participants

Just on Wednesday, I received a letter from one of last year's participants - someone who had been very quiet throughout our six weeks together, so that I must confess I really did not know how significant the Institute had been for her. I think the letter is significant enough to warrant reproducing it for you:

"Dear Dr. Sondermann,

The institute will be over by the time you get this. (She is obviously pessimistic about the postal service). The schedule certainly looks interesting. I am glad to see you on the program more times, and the topics on Latin America. I really wish I had been attending this summer instead of last summer because I have made some recovery from the death in my family of late May a year ago - enough to want to participate more.

I have just finished a course at the University of Texas in Government and Politics of China with emphasis on ideology, leadership, control, and social mobilization.

During the spring semester we offered the elective half-year course in Government with 8 weeks devoted to something like I.R. There were 31 in the class. I worked around kinship - sense of neighborhood - culture, ideology, way of making a living, institutions and decision-making from tribal days to the present, with more emphasis on nationalism to internationalism. I used the same idea, maybe in a more vague way, with the other half of the course which was on cities. Back to the first half, we did a lot on Marxism-Leninism, Maoism, case studies of China and Middle East, emerging nations as a whole, and some of the topics in Great Decisions.

In regular required civics I ventured from the regular institutional approach. Further pursuit of many things mentioned in the institute made this possible. Just two examples: used Lord of the Flies, Animal Farm, and Fention's "Prison Camp" with a unit on types of government. The students bought Sorensen's Decision-Making in the White House. After discussing this book, the kids were always referring to something in it when they talked about current activities of the President. Next year I hope to do more with bureaucracy and use Seven Days in May and Iron Mountain in some way.

As you can see, I would say the Institute was great and very helpful. I'm sure the current one is even better. I would like to attend one every summer. . . ."

L. McA.

## DETAILED SCHEDULE FOR FIRST WEEK

**Monday, June 16th**

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:45 - 9:45 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | Sondermann: Introduction to Institute |
| 9:45 - 10:05 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | Coffee |
| 10:05 - -1:00 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Sondermann: Introduction to International Affairs |
| 12:00 non<br>Rastall Dining Room | Lunch * |
| 1:00 - 2:30 p.m. | Seminars<br>Political Science (Finley) - Palmer 216<br>Economics (Werner - Tutt, B-1, B-2<br>Sociology (Boderman) - Palmer - 37 |

**Tuesday, June 17th**

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:45 - 9:45 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Boderman: Social Stratification: The United States |
| 9:45 - 10:05 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | Coffee |
| 10:05 - 11:00 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Discussion ** |
| 11:10 a.m. - 12:00 p.m. | Seminars (as above) |

**Wednesday, June 18th**

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:45 - 9:45 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Boderman: Social Stratification: Some International Comparisons |
| 9:45 - 10:05 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | Coffee |
| 10:05 - 11:00 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Discussion |
| 7:30 p.m.<br>Phi Delt Living Room | (optional) Theodore Von Laue: The "Cultural Envelope" Concept |

Thursday, June 19th

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:45 - 9:45 a.m. | Von Laue: The Global World: A Collection of Case Histories |
| 9:45 - 10:05 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | Coffee |
| 10:05 - 11:00 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Discussion |
| 12:00 noon<br>Rastall Dining Room | Lunch |
| 1:00 - 2:30 p.m. | Seminars |

Friday, June 20th

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:45 - 9:45 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Pettit: U.S. - Latin American Relations in the 19th and 20th Centuries |
| 9:45 - 10:05 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | Coffee |
| 10:05 - 11:00 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Discussion |
| Evening | Social Event (for participants and spouses) at the Finleys (details to be announced later) |

* A section of the Rastall Center Dining Room is set aside for the use of Institute participants for lunch each day. We hope that most of you will wish to go there for your lunches, to continue discussions and have the kinds of informal contacts which are so important for the Institute. Two days of the week -namely, Mondays and Thursdays, all of us will have lunch together at the time indicated, but the section will be available on other days as well, and I hope that most of us will make use of it.

** The 11:00 adjournment time is flexible. Depending on how the discussion is going, we may go beyond that time; or we may break up earlier. The time between 11 and lunch is set aside for individual pursuits, reading, browsing through the Resource Center, and discussions with faculty members who are available in their offices during this period.

## Detailed Program for Second Week

## Institute in International Affairs

## Colorado College

**Monday, June 23**

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:45 - 9:45 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | M. East, "Basic Aspects of Comparative Systems Analysis." |
| 9:45 - 10:05 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | Coffee |
| 10:05 - 11:00 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Discussion |
| 12:00 noon<br>Rastall | Lunch |
| 1:00 - 2:30 p.m.<br>various places | Seminar (same as first week) |
| 2:45 - 4:15 p.m.<br>Olin Lounge | (Optional). Arthur Gilbert, U. of Denver, "America Goes to War: The Historical Experience." |

**Tuesday, June 24**

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:45 - 9:45 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | A. Boderman, "Social Stratification: Psychological Dimensions." |
| 9:45 - 10:05 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | Coffee |
| 10:05 - 11:00 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Discussion |
| 11:10 - 12:40 p.m.<br>various places | Seminars |
| 1:30 - 2:45 p.m.<br>Olin Lounge | (Optional) A. Gilbert, "Some Reflections on Ideology and International Affairs." |

**Wednesday, June 25**

Open Day. Those wishing to visit the Air Force Academy will meet in Rastall in time to leave promptly at 9 a.m.

**Thursday, June 26**

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:45 - 9:45 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | F. Sondermann, "Three Explanations of International Politics." |
| 9:45 - 10:05 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | Coffee |
| 10:05 - 11:00 a.m. | Discussion |

Thursday, June 26, contd.

| | |
|---|---|
| 12 noon<br>Rastall | Lunch |
| 1:00 - 2:30 p.m.<br>various places | Last sessions of first two-week sequence of Seminars |

Friday, June 27

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:45 - 9:45 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Smith, Sondermann, and everybody: "Application of Materials to the Classroom." |
| 9:45 - 10:05 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | Coffee |
| 10:05 - 11:00 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Continuation of discussion, as above. |

Detailed Program for Third Week

EPDA Institute in International Affairs

Colorado College, Summer 1969

Monday, June 30th

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:45 - 9:45 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | David Finley, "Belief Systems and Political Process: The Marxist-Leninist Case." |
| 9:45 - 10:00 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | Coffee |
| 10:00 - 11:00 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Discussion |
| 12:00 noon<br>Rastall | Lunch |
| 1:00 - 2:30 p.m.<br>various places | Seminars. Second Series of Seminars begins. |
| 2:45 - 4:15 p.m.<br>Institute House | (optional). Timothy Fuller, "Two Images of Politics: I - Hobbes." |

Tuesday, July 1st

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:45 - 9:45 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Ray Werner, "The Evaluation of Alternative Economic Systems." |
| 9:45 - 10:00 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | Coffee |
| 10:00 - 11:00 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Discussion |
| 11:10 - 12:40 p.m.<br>various places | Seminars |
| 1:30 - 3:00 p.m.<br>Olin Lounge | INS Simulation Orientation Session (Maurice East). |

Wednesday, July 2nd

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:45 - 9:45 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Fred Sondermann, "What Kind of Knowledge do we want our Students to have about Foreign Policy and International Affairs?" |
| 9:45 - 10:00 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Coffee |
| 10:00 - 11:00 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Discussion |

1:30 p.m. - ?
Olin Lounge

INS Simulation, under direction of Maurice East.

Thursday, July 3rd

8:45 - 9:45 a.m.
Olin 100

Maurice East, "The Changing Role of Small States in World Politics."

9:45 - 10:00 a.m.
Olin Lounge

Coffee

10:00 - 11:00 a.m.
Olin 100

Discussion

11:10 - 12:40 p.m.
various places

Seminars

12:45 - ?
Rastall

Lunch

Friday, July 4th

Holiday

Detailed Program for Fourth Week

Institute in International Affairs, Colorado College

July 7 - 11, 1969

Monday, July 7th

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 8:45 - 9:45 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | David Finley, "Belief Systems and Political Process: Constitutional Democracies." | |
| 9:45 - 10:00 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | Coffee | |
| 10:00 - 11:00 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Discussion | |
| 11:00 - 11:30 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | (optional): | Review of first half of Institute, discussion of plans, approaches, procedures for second half. (Bob Smith, Fred Sondermann, and participants) |
| 12:00 noon<br>Rastall | Lunch | |
| 1:00 -2:30 p.m.<br>various places | Seminars | |
| 2:45 - 4:00 p.m.<br>Institute House | (optional): | Frank Tucker, "China's Historical Experience in International Relations (to 1937)". |

Tuesday, July 8th

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 8:45 - 9:45 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Ray Werner, "The Institutions of Capitalism." | |
| 9:45 - 10:00 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | Coffee | |
| 10:00 - 11:00 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Discussion | |
| 11:10 - 12:40<br>carious places | Seminars | |
| 1:30 - 3:00 p.m.<br>Institute House | (optional): | Frank Tucker, "China, Russia, and Japan: Their Recent Problems in International Relations (since 1937." |

Wednesday, July 9th

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:45 - 9:45 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Ray Werner, "An Economic Evaluation of Marxist Theory and Practice." |
| 9:45 - 10:00 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | Coffee |
| 10:00 - 11:00 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Discussion |
| 12:50 p.m. | (for those who signed up). Bus leaves Rastall Center for visit to Underground Combat Operations Center, NORAD. |
| 7:30 p.m.<br>Institute House | (optional): Informal discussion on the teaching of controversial materials, and other questions of interest. (Sondermann) |

Thursday, July 10th

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:45 - 9:45 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Applications of various concepts and materials to the classroom. (Various presentations, under direction of Robert Smith). |
| 9:45 - 10:00 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | Coffee |
| 10:00 - 11:00 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Continuation of the morning's program. |
| 11:00 - 11:30 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Thomas Collins, African-American Institute, will speak on the service his organization can provide to interested High School teachers. Mr. Collins will be available, by arrangement, for individual and small-group discussions during the afternoon. (Optional) |
| 12:00<br>Rastall Center | Lunch |
| 1:00 - 2:30 p.m.<br>various places | Seminars |
| 7:30 p.m.<br>Institute House | (optional) Glenn McLaughlin, "Lending for African Development." |

Friday, July 11th

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:45 - 9:45 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Glenn McLaughlin, "Progress in West African Development." |
| 9:45 - 10:00 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | Coffee |
| 10:00 - 11:00 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Discussion. (Mr. McLaughlin will be available, by arrangement, for individual and small-group discussions either Thursday afternoon or through lunch and early afternoon on Friday). |

## Detailed Program for Fifth Week

## Institute in International Affairs, Colorado College, Summer 1969

### Monday, July 14th

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:45 - 9:45 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | M. East, "Political Integration: A Process and a Case Study" |
| 9:45 - 10:00 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | Coffee |
| 10:00 - 11:00 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | Discussion |
| 12:00 noon<br>Rastall | Lunch. Note: Don Morris of the Foreign Policy Association will be at the lunch; it may be an opportunity for information discussion with him. |
| 1:00 - 2:30 p.m.<br>various places | Seminars - New series of Seminars begin |
| 2:45 - 4:00 p.m.<br>Institute House | Don Morris will discuss the services which the Foreign Policy Association provides for High School Studies teachers. (Optional). |

### Tuesday, July 15th

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:45 - 9:45 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | D. Finley, "Belief Systems and Political Process: The Third World." |
| 9:45 - 10:00 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | Coffee |
| 10:00 - 11:00 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | Discussion |
| 11:10 - 12:30 p.m.<br>various places | Seminars |
| 1:30 - 3:00 p.m.<br>Institute House | Glenn Brooks, Department of Political Science, will speak on "Report on East Africa." (optional) |
| 7:30 p.m.<br>Institute House | Informal discussion, led by Don Dausch, on "The New York Teachers Strike" (and related subjects). Optional. |

### Wednesday, July 16th

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:45 - 11:00 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | A. Pettit, "The Potential for Revolution in Contemporary Latin America." |
| 9:45 - 10:00 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | Coffee |
| 10:00 -11:00 a.m. | Discussion |

Wednesday, July 16th, contd.

| | |
|---|---|
| 7:30 p.m.<br>Institute House | Chief Sowande, "Reflections on African Affairs." (optional) |

Thursday, July 17th

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:45 - 9:45 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Chief Sowande, "Human Affairs in an Age of Confrontation." |
| 9:45 - 10:00 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | Coffee |
| 10:00 - 11:00 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Discussion |
| 12:00 noon<br>Rastall | Lunch |
| 1:00 - 2:30 p.m.<br>various places | Seminars |
| 2:45 - 4:00 p.m.<br>Institute House | Robert Loevy, Department of Political Science, "The Political Novel." (optional) |

Friday, July 18th

OPEN DAY

Institute in International Affairs

Colorado College, Summer 1969

SCHEDULE FOR SIXTH AND FINAL WEEK

Monday, July 21st

| | |
|---|---|
| 10:30 a.m. - 12 noon<br>Olin 100 | M. East, "International Organizations: Some Suggestions for a Unit," followed by discussion. |
| 12:00 - 1:00 p.m.<br>Rastall | Lunch |
| 1:00 - 2:30 p.m.<br>various places | Seminars |

Tuesday, July 22nds

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:45 - 9:45 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | A. M. Pettit, "Four Centuries of Dishonor: A Comparison of Latin American and United States Race Relations." |
| 9:45 - 10:00 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | Coffee |
| 10:00 - 11:00 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | Discussion |
| 11:10 - 12:40 p.m.<br>various places | Seminars |
| 1:30 - 3:00 p.m.<br>Olin 100 (note place) | M. Bird, "Aspects of Economic Development in Latin America," (optional) |

Wednesday, July 23rd

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:45 - 11:00 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Faye Metcalf, West Burnett, Malcolm Ownes (participants in last year's Institute) on the application of Institute-related materials, concepts, etc. in classrooms. |

Thursday, July 24th

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:45 - 9:45 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Charles Rivera, "New Directions in Social Sciences." |
| 9:45 - 10:00 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | Coffee |
| 10:00 - 11:00 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | Discussion |
| 12:00 - 1:00 p.m.<br>Rastall | Lunch |

Thursday, July 24th, contd.

| | |
|---|---|
| 1:00 - 2:30 p.m.<br>various places | Seminars |

Friday, July 25th

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:45 - 9:45 a.m.<br>Olin 100 | Concluding session. Comments by Fred Sondermann and others. |
| 9:45 a.m.<br>Olin Lounge | Coffee and Sweet Rolls, and tearful farewells. |

The End of the Institute

APPENDIX 7

If I had to do it all over again . . .

(or: Suggestions to anyone else who may wish to do it over again . . .)

(or: Reflections on the Evaluation Sheets)

Note: These are changes I would suggest. For the most part, I think we have a good Institute going, but surely it can always be improved.

A. Preparation for the Institute

1. Maybe we can send a tentative schedule to participants earlier than we did this year; or else send a schedule of the last previous Institute with the acceptance letters, so that potential participants know fairly well what they may expect.

2. Check with Campus Housing Office whether it might not be possible to set aside one house for single persons and another for those with children, including children below 12 - hopefully at somewhat reduced rates for families. It is much better for people to live on campus.

   For those wishing to live in town, send them a map of the city and a copy of a newspaper with housing ads. Maybe a copy of a paper per week.

B. Morning Sessions

1. Do vary the format of these sessions more than we did this year. Have lectures, discussions, debates, silms, participant presentations, etc. Always allow time for discussion afterwards.

2. Do for all lectures what we only managed to do for some this year - namely, provide fairly detailed outlines ahead of time. In fact, if these are sufficiently detailed, one can go to questions and discussion immediately, without lecturing at all.

3. Provide an opportunity for those who do not wish to participate in a large group discussion to join a smaller group after the initial presentation. This group could perhaps be led by the Assistant Director or another faculty member.

4. Provide suggested readings prior to morning presentations. Stress brief articles rather than chapters or entire books.

5. I think some tightening up of the schedule of presentations is indicated. If we continue with the three-part emphasis (Sociology, Politics, and Economics), then presentations for each of these should be compressed within a single week.

6. Lay great stress on calling on participants for comments before calling on faculty, i.e. if two hands are up, one of a participant and one of a staff member, call on the participant first.

7. Try to arrange for some more controversial and provocative presentations. Have some specific coverage of problems in U.S. foreign policy.

8. Prepare a reference list for each topic discussed, so that members who wish to pursue this topic will have a guide on which to proceed.

C. Seminars

1. I suggest consideration of eliminating the Sociology Seminar and covering relevant sociological and social-psychological topics in general sessions, and substituting a Seminar in International Affairs/American Foreign Policy proper in its place. Retain a sociologist on the staff, in the same kind of role as we know have a historian.

2. Reduce the required book reading list and substitute more articles and excerpts.

3. At least part of the time in each Seminar, pose a question or problem and let participants research the answers themselves, coming prepared with specific evidence to be submitted to the other members of the seminar.

4. Hand out reference lists for subjects covered.

5. Either set aside one Seminar session for coverage of fundamental concepts in the discipline, or handle this on an optional basis for those who are interested.

6. Give out "study questions" ahead of each Seminar session.

D. Other Institute Programs, Curricular

1. Arrange that more and better use is made of the Resource Center. If recommendations C.2. and 3. are adopted, this may take care of itself. Ask members ahead of time to bring along materials that they consider useful. Ask members of past Institutes to send such material, with the understanding that it will be returned.

2. Look through the materials that were distributed to last year's and this year's group ahead of time and reproduce those that are considered to be particularly valuable for future groups.

3. Continue INS Simulation, but also add a day during which two or three other Simulations are presented and tried.

4. We can do much better with films than we have done so far. I suggest that in the future, for a change, we start with consideration of the films to be shown, rather than adding them almost as an afterthought. Arrange to have two or three films shown to the entire group; either during morning sessions or in the evenings. The idea of an "IR Film Festival Day" appeals to me. Se whether films that are not to be shown to the entire group, and apparatus, can be stored in the Institute House for ready access at all times.

5. Arrange for more foreign speakers. Staffs of San Francisco consulates would be a good source, and reduce cost of transportation. State Department should be invited to send a speaker, as should UN. If this does not work out, utilize foreign students in the area.

6. I think we can reduce the number of local speakers. In fact, I wonder whether we could prepare a list of possible speakers and their topics and let the group, during the first week, make the decision on whom to invite and when.

E. Other Institute Programs - Extracurricular

1. Organize a committee of members' wives (living in town), asking them to arrange for social events among them for themselves and their children, as well as for the whole families.

2. Organize some car-pools, so that members who visit scenic spots in the area and have room in their cars can take others along. A Bulletin Board for this purpose (and other purposes) would be very appropriate.

3. Have a coffee for wives in the middle of the first week of the Institute.

4. Have some evening discussions, purely optional, at the homes of Staff members or at the homes of participants.

5. Check into the availability of Cossitt Gym for certain evening of the week.